

# WASHINGTON SENTINEL.

VOL. XXVI.

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., SATURDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1898

NO 25

## Washington Sentinel.

Published and Edited by

LOUIS SCHADE.

Fred Schade, Business Manager

APPEARS EVERY SATURDAY.

### TERMS

\$3 per year for single copy sent by mail to subscribers, payable in advance.

### RATES OF ADVERTISING:

First insertion, one inch, \$1.50; second insertion, 75 cents. Liberal deductions made for annual advertisements. Special notices 25 cents a line.

Advertisements to insure insertion should be handed in not later than 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

Office: No. 804 E Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Sample copies mailed upon application. Address LOUIS SCHADE, Washington, D. C.

### Why We Should Have a Congressional Investigation.

It is evident that the present session of Congress will inaugurate an era of investigation. Charges affecting the conduct of the war itself, accusations against various departments and by name against sundry officials intrusted with responsible duties, accumulate. The Democratic party should have sought to make more political capital out of these charges, and right there is where our Democratic National Committee made its mistake. We know that deep down in the hearts of our people there always abides a sentiment in favor of fair play. Although the public prefers to wait the result of official inquiry before rendering its verdict, it will not stand for this whitewashing process of the present Alger Relief Commission. They have the right to insist, and we insist, upon a rigid Congressional investigation of every charge worthy of consideration. The duty of Congress is obvious, and we have no doubt that at least Leader Bailey and all his Democratic associates will contribute their services to make the investigation entirely satisfactory. (Mr. Bailey stands on the Democratic platform, and his position on the annexation and other questions, in spite of the mean calumnies of the New York Journal and other misleading undemocratic sheets, is the correct and proper one.)

Among these accusations is more than one in regard to army and navy contracts. For some reason not clearly understood, the very responsible and exacting task of leasing and buying transports and other vessels required for the use of the Government was committed, not to army and navy officers, upon whom such a duty would naturally devolve, but to an individual called from the ranks of private life and entrusted with the expenditure of millions of dollars. The transport service was probably one of the worst that has been criticized. It is said that transports were purchased and rented at the most exorbitant prices; that in some instances steamers which were claimed to have a speed of sixteen or twenty knots, and which were bought on that basis, while carrying the troops were never able to exceed thirteen knots; that these steamers were hired at extravagant rates per diem, but were not placed under the command of naval officers, and that their commanders deliberately planned to delay their voyages so as to extend the period of the lease to the utmost. The history of the score of transports which went to the Philippines was most discreditable to those who were responsible for the fulfillment of their contracts, and the owners of comparatively worthless vessels readily got rid of their property by selling it to the Government at extraordinary prices. These charges are of such a nature that a rigid investigation is demanded. And the end is not yet, for it is said that an organized cabal of politicians long since planned to secure from the Government concessions and contracts in our new possessions that will yield to the favored ones enormous wealth. Nothing would be so destructive of the success of this Administration as failure to prove the innocence of those who have been unjustly charged with guilt, and to prove the guilt of those who are responsible for needlessly sacrificing noble lives.

An American girl who married a title has written a book warning her fellow countrywomen against the evil. Is there any guarantee that the proceeds from the sale of the book will not be swiped by the titled husband?

### The President's Message.

The public interest in the President's message centres in his observations on the war and its settlements.

As the proclaimed object of the war was to secure the freedom and independence of Cuba, the first inquiry will naturally be as to the President's attitude toward that island, the sovereignty of which has been surrendered by Spain. Even the most captious foreign critic must admit that the President stands squarely by the resolutions of Congress. He says that—"Spanish rule must be replaced by a just, benevolent and humane government, created by the people of Cuba, capable of performing all international obligations," and that "as soon as we are in possession of Cuba and have pacified the island it will be necessary to give aid and direction to its people to form a government for themselves. This should be undertaken at the earliest moment consistent with safety and assured success," but "until there is complete tranquility in the island and a stable government inaugurated military occupation will be continued."

There is in this no suggestion of annexation—and yet there are probably few intelligent Americans or well informed foreigners who doubt that Cuba will, before many years, become a part of the United States.

Next in order of more immediate interest and importance are the President's views as to the Philippines—the great unsettled question left open by the protocol and not definitely settled by the treaty conditions to which Spain's Commissioners have assented. And on this question, as on the government of Porto Rico and our other new possessions, Mr. McKinley withholds his ideas. "Such discussion," he says, "will be appropriate after the treaty of peace shall be ratified. In the meantime, and until Congress has legislated otherwise, he will continue the military governments which have existed since our occupation, and give to the people security in life and property and encouragement under a just and beneficent rule."

It is quite certain that the Senate will not postpone discussion of these questions until after the treaty shall have been ratified. The proposed payment of \$20,000,000 to Spain for islands which she does not control, and whose people claim the right to govern themselves, will hardly pass without question. Neither will the commercial policy of the "open door," which the President likewise omits to mention. Pending the completion and formal signing of the treaty the President may properly withhold his views as to "the government or the future of our new possessions," but he can hardly expect to have the treaty ratified without a thorough discussion. This is not the American method of government. Neither is it the custom of the Senate.

Does the President perhaps unwittingly give an indication of his policy as to the future of these new possessions in a phrase which he uses in celebrating the formal annexation of Hawaii? He speaks of the inhabitants of these islands as having "elected to share our political heritage." If they are to be admitted to "share our political heritage," they cannot consistently be denied a voice in its management. The President's commission, it is understood, will report a plan for a Territorial government for Hawaii, including the usual Delegate in Congress. He will have no vote, but the Delegate is the forerunner of the Representative. That is to say, 2,000 Americans in Hawaii are to have the same representation in the House as more than 200,000 inhabitants of this country. And this little group of islands, inhabited by a mongrel population of 90,000, tainted with leprosy, will ultimately have an equal representation in the Senate with New York and her 7,000,000.

Is this to be a precedent? And has Mr. McKinley considered the power and the effect of precedent in this country?

The President asks for an increase of the regular army to 100,000 men, or at any rate for an appropriation to the President thus to increase it in case of need. If we are to enter upon a career of expansion and imperialism this force does not seem to be too great. We must keep soldiers in Cuba, soldiers in Porto Rico and soldiers in the Philippines. A hundred thousand will certainly not more than "go round." It will cost us about \$145,000,000 a year to maintain

such an army, but he who dances must pay the piper.

The President recommends for the navy three gigantic battleships, three great armored cruisers, the highest speed, three big protected cruisers and six smaller cruisers, the whole to cost, exclusive of armor or guns, \$31,296,800. The armor and guns will cost about as much more, making the total cost for the increase of the navy somewhat more than \$60,000,000.

This is a necessary if somewhat expensive policy. We have two enormous coast lines to defend. We have, besides, our new acquisitions in the West Indies, the Philippines, Hawaii and elsewhere to defend—and perhaps some of them even to conquer. We must have a more powerful navy.

He urges appropriations for the Nicaragua Canal, for subsidized steamer lines to our newly acquired possessions, for a centennial celebration of the city of Washington, for a larger representation at the Paris Exposition and for many other costly things.

### Ungrateful Spain.

Spain is not satisfied to be left in possession of the Carolines and Ladrones and to get \$20,000,000 for the Philippines. The President during the war needed but to say the word in order to accomplish the capture of every island owned by Spain in the Pacific. He had but to say the word and the Canaries would have been ours, and the seaports of Spain likewise. There is no reason, except generosity, for handing over one dollar for the Philippines. Nevertheless Spain is not content. She has the effrontery to ask that the destruction of the Maine be declared an accident. Her design is to get an acknowledgment which, officially at least, would free her from the stain of a hideous and treacherous crime.

The answer to that request should be a demand for the detection and punishment of the assassins who sent 266 American sailors to the bottom of Havana harbor. It was an official electric button that exploded an official mine under the Maine. Weyler knew of the button and the mine, and knew that they were intended for the use to which they were put. It is known in Havana who touched that button; is it known in Madrid? Were Spain's Government a civilized government and innocent, the destroyers of the Maine would have been brought to exposure and the halter long ere this.

Our late enemy misconceives the situation utterly. Instead of cultivating a sense of injury Spain should be on her knees thanking God that the United States has not dealt with her as Germany dealt with France, or as she herself has habitually dealt with the Cubans and Filipinos.

### Shall We Ratify or Rectify?

The treaty with Spain is not yet concluded, but it will be very soon. We know now pretty well what it will stipulate.

It will shoulder upon the country not only the governance and redemption of Cuba and Porto Rico from the semi-barbarism in which Spanish misrule has left them, but also the conquest and control of the Philippines and other Spanish possessions in the South Seas.

Now, suppose the judgment of the Senate should be—as is by no means unlikely—that in these arrangements Mr. McKinley has undertaken more than the people want to undertake?

In that case the Senate need not reject the treaty of peace. It may amend it by striking out the clause requiring us to buy a war in the Philippines at cost of \$20,000,000 and substituting for it a provision giving us a coaling station there, which is quite all that we need, and leaving Spain to wrestle as best she can with problems that this country may well be excused from tackling.

This is at least a possibility.

### Chairman Danford.

Chairman Danford of the Committee on Labor and Immigration has been urging an early consideration of the immigration bill passed by the Senate last session and imposing an educational qualification on immigrants. Conditions have changed so materially since the passage of the bill last year that its bringing up is bound to provoke more opposition than hitherto. It has been pointed out that this bill might raise some puzzling questions on the part of opponents, who would argue that the country was about to adopt a few million of Malays, and could not gracefully put up barriers to Europeans.

### Administration Gives the Democracy a Winning Issue.

Secretary Alger has supplied what some Democrats have not hoped to see—an issue upon which the Democracy can appeal with confidence to the national judgment. By asking for over \$165,000,000 for the support of the regular army in time of peace he has raised to questions that touch the heart and the pocket of every American citizen who does not profit by legalized injustice and oppression. These questions are:

"Shall the United States be more heavily taxed for military purposes than any other country on earth?"

"Shall this unheard-of burden of taxation be carried almost exclusively by people of small means, while the wealthier armaments protect goes free?"

If we spend \$166,000,000 a year for the army, \$150,000,000 for pensions and \$50,000,000 for the navy, we shall be paying \$366,000,000 for military purposes. That is nearly twice as much as any power in Europe pays for the same objects. It is more than we paid in taxes for the entire support of the Government as lately as last year. The amount Secretary Alger asks for the army alone is more than Germany pays for her army and navy combined. We have been accustomed to commiserate the European peasant, crushed under the intolerable burden of standing armies, and now we are asked, with no necessity whatever, to subject ourselves to a burden twice as great.

But the distribution of this burden of taxation is even worse than the load itself. Mr. Rockefeller, to take the most conspicuous specimen of a class, has a fortune of over \$300,000,000. His power to accumulate, possess and increase this fortune depends upon the protection of the Government.

Mr. Rockefeller's income is over \$20,000,000 a year. That is equal to the combined incomes of forty thousand families, each living on annual earnings of \$500. Under the Republican system of national taxation, which is based not on resources but on personal consumption, Mr. Rockefeller's income, if divided among forty thousand families, would be taxed forty thousand times; concentrated in his hands, it need be taxed only once. In other words, with forty thousand times the means of a workingman, Mr. Rockefeller is not obliged to pay more than a workingman's taxes.

In some respects he pays less. He uses no beer or tobacco, and so escapes the taxation levied on those humble luxuries. He does not play cards, and so does not pay for the revenue stamp on every pack. He does not live in rented rooms, and so is not taxed for his lease and his rent receipts. He does not borrow money on mortgage, subject to a mortgage stamp tax. He has his family physician, and so does not buy taxed proprietary medicines. He drinks no more tea than a sewing girl starved on four dollars a week, and if he used a quality as fine as that shipped by the Emperor of China he would still pay only the sewing girl's tax of ten cents a pound. He uses no more taxed sugar than is consumed by a day laborer, and wears little more taxed clothing.

Practically all of Mr. Rockefeller's gigantic income is absolutely exempt from national taxation, while every person of moderate means is taxed to the teeth.

Is that right? The Democracy does not think so. It believes that incomes and not family expenditures should be the measure of taxation.

No extravagance in Government. Necessary expenses to be met by fair methods of taxation.

There is an issue ready made to the hand of the Democracy, and it is a winning one.

### Free Trade in the Sulu.

Berliner Neueste Nachrichten.

The treaty of 1877 between Spain, Great Britain and Germany secured freedom of trade in the Sulu Archipelago for English and German shipping. Prince Bismarck at that time successfully contested the claims of Spain to have the Sulu Islands regarded as belonging to the Philippine group. It is not yet known what the intentions of the United States Government with regard to these islands may be. But, in its hasty assumption that America will claim them and will establish the American Customs tariff there and in the Philippines, a section of the German Press is already declaring that "this is a point on which an understanding with England, with a view to joint action, appears to us to be indispensable."

### SEACOAST DEFENSE.

Written for the WASHINGTON SENTINEL BY WEST STREET.

One of the cardinal features of that peculiar discipline introduced by the ex-officers of artillery of the United States army was that the works erected were to protect the guns and not the officers or men, when engaged against the artillery or men-of-war of the opposing force. As soon as a gunboat or other vessel of war opened on a battery it was the duty of a commissioned officer to immediately mount the parapet if in barbettes or stand outside if in casemates, at each gun, and place himself to the windward side, so as to mark the effect of a shot fired or to report the number of seconds between the flash and report of the gun of the vessel against which he was pitted. As no broadside was ever fired except from a sloop of war, and then only on rare occasions, the officers soon got the hang of timing this flash and report with the greatest accuracy. The number of seconds being reported, the range in number of yards was found by multiplying the number of seconds by 365 (easily remembered as the number of days in the year) with the thermometer (Fahrenheit) at 52 (the number of weeks in the year) degrees and corrected by 4 yards plus or minus for each ten degrees above or below. This, with the table of ranges in the Ordnance Manual, which was generally committed to memory, enabled the gunner to give the necessary elevation and to direct the cutting of the fuse for the requisite time. Frequently the return shot was fired before that on the other side had travelled half the distance between the opposing forces. So rigid was this discipline enforced that no officer ever thought of retreating under cover, unless the particular zip of the Minie rifle ball warned him that to remain would be a useless sacrifice of his life.

While he was exposed to artillery fire he was expected to stay and thus teach his command a contempt for the artillery of the enemy, so far as human life was concerned. It was for this reason that infantry, that had served in the field, was found unsatisfactory when detailed on heavy artillery duty. They would hug the parapet. Cavalry and light artillery have the same fault, added to a restive nature, which made them soon an unmitigated nuisance, when employed in that branch of the service. They cannot be made to understand that the role of heavy artillery is against material and not against personnel, against fortifications and vessels of war primarily and against flesh and blood only consequentially.

Another rule which was enforced inflexibly was that there should be no dodging. Neither officer or man was permitted under any circumstances to dodge under fire. This was especially trying when engaging vessels of war at a distance and no return fire permitted, so as to entice them to draw nearer. The rifle projectiles fired at long range soon lose their initial velocity, and revolving on their own axis can be seen by the naked eye, and when observed seem to be travelling exactly in the line of fire where the observer stands. Each one looks as big as a lamp-post and is far more demoralizing than the mortar shell, as that is only seen when it explodes. No officer or man can perform properly his duty at the guns if he is engaged in dodging the shot of the enemy. At night, though, the relative effect between the rifle projectile and the mortar shell is reversed. The time fuse of the latter then can be seen, while the percussion fuse of the former is of course invisible until it strikes.

Another rule laid down and followed from the beginning to the end of the heavy artillery campaign, if I may so term it, in the Mississippi Valley (say commencing from the first action with the two gunboats Lexington and Conestoga under Commodore Foote above Columbus, Ky., on November 7, 1861, and ending in the surrender of Vicksburg, July 4, 1863), was the difference of conduct prescribed for the different detachments in firing mortars and firing the other heavy guns. As there was no provision provided for recoil in the mortar bed, the detachment was allowed to retire to the adjacent traverse whence the lanyard, lengthened for that purpose, was pulled to fire the friction tube. But this was not allowed with the other guns, where the detachments had to stand up and take their chances. The result of this was that while no loss was experienced by the bursting of mortars, some of the best officers and men were either killed or wounded by the bursting of heavy guns, mostly by those which had been rifled from smooth bores. In the early engagements with the Federal gunboats on the upper Mississippi, the Confederates lost more officers and men killed and wounded by the bursting of heavy guns than was inflicted by the fire from the gunboats. This was also the experience of the Federal navy; as I have seen stated by several officers who served on gunboats on the Cumberland, Tennessee, Mississippi and Yazoo rivers. Nothing is so trying to the courage of artilleryists as this fear of the bursting of guns in action.

Another rule was not allowing, at night, any detachment of troops or sailors to come near the battery, without giving the parole. A single individual was permitted to pass on delivering the countersign, but even the smallest detachment had to be accompanied by a

commissioned officer with the parole. As each gun detachment was commanded by a commissioned officer, and frequently in detached works at some distance from the covering force, it was his duty to enforce the above regulation to prevent surprise and spiking the gun by a landing or other party of the enemy which had obtained the countersign. Great difficulty was found in carrying out orders on this point while acting in co-operation with the navy. Though particular attention was paid to sending the parole with the countersign to the commander of the fleet, the naval officer commanding the boat's party never remembered the necessity of having the parole until the landing was effected, and it was too late to return to his ship for it. The order though never admitted any exception and was impressed upon every subordinate by the commanding artillery officer. I am satisfied that no red-legged infantryman would ever have allowed himself and his second-in-command to have been dragged from their beds by a small cavalry detachment and taken through the lines of an army of twelve thousand men, as was done with Generals Crook and Kelly in 1864 at Cumberland, Md.

The only way to teach the navy and covering infantry of the necessity of having the parole was to detain the detachment until released by higher authority, which, with the navy, was frequently not until the next morning, and then only after much cursing, deep but not drawn, but never asked, of the navy. Heavy artillery is always at great disadvantage when co-operating with a navy. The naval officer regards one gun on water as equal to twenty on shore and as the heavy artillery officer entertains just the reverse idea, it is impossible to reconcile two such conflicting opinions. Great jealousy always will exist between the two services, which is deplorable, as a sea coast defense can be effective without the mutual aid rendered to each other at the opportune moment. Preparation in time of peace is more than half the game of war, and as the two services are rarely if ever, exercised together, before a war, the result is that there is no previous effort of employing them together made before the emergency arises.

From recent inquiry, I find that I am the surviving senior officer in rank commanding batteries of heavy artillery which engaged the fleet coming down the Mississippi River, as well as those which came from below after the capture of Fort Jackson and St. Philip, and it is a melancholy pleasure to bear witness as above to the iron discipline employed, as well as the professional skill displayed, by my superior officers of the artillery arm of the old service, who have since "gone to that bourne, whence no traveller returneth." They had their faults—who have not? Perhaps their greatest was that they held their guns in too high estimation, while human life was cheap in their sight, when these guns were in peril. Even when ordering their detachments under cover, they never sought it for themselves. Their dauntless bravery proceeded, not from a sense of duty, but from the highest sense of duty, and they never asked a non-commissioned officer to do any act which they were not ready to perform themselves. Brought before the war into immediate contact with the fashionable society of our great maritime cities in the winter and at seaside resorts in the summer, they had naturally greater polish of manners than was to be found among their brother officers confined to frontier posts. This also gave them the opportunity of studying the nature of the American in his civil character. To gain his confidence as well as to enter into the lively circle of his sympathies. To this fact, and his great superiority over his fellow officers of other arms of the service as a commander of men. The "sovereign in uniform" is a natural born deserter. He does not join the enemy, but when tired of the monotony of camp life, he is apt to dispense with the routine forms of a furlough, and depart to ensconce himself in the neighboring swamp or the impenetrable thicket, adjacent to his former home. There he rummates over the mutability of human events and sets the civil sheriff and his posse *ramatis* at defiance. He laughs in his sleeve at the repeated proclamations of pardon by the President, if he returns to duty within a specified period of time. Tired of this life of inglorious ease or perhaps stimulated to desire a change of scene by the proximity of a military party "hunting for deserters," he proceeds to pasture his nose and meadows green where he steals a horse, joins the cavalry under an assumed name and then becomes a licensed military marauder, raiding the country, doing the most mischief to his own side than the enemy, and is given the opportunity to treat the Governor's proclamation with the same contempt as he previously had done to that of the President. No one can appreciate more than I do the great services which an efficient cavalry can render while acting with an army in the field. But there is no greater curse to a country than a force of cavalry on a raid. In the former case it is emphatically the eyes and ears of the army. It doubles the efficiency of the army in rendering thousands of one services too numerous to enumerate. Among the most valuable is that of drawing supplies from the adjacent country, too bulky and perishable to be furnished by the regular lines of communication, and without such supplies an army is soon forced to retreat. But I know no terms too strong to denounce a raiding cavalry. It is the greatest misfortune which an unfortunate nation in its defence can endure. Armies consist of infantry, all other arms are subsidiary, and the quickest way to ruin good infantry is to allow cavalry to go off on raiding parties. It is impossible to keep infantry to their colors, when they can desert and join the cavalry on marauding expeditions.

After this digression I close with the remark that while desertion was rife in all the other arms of the service, there was none in the heavy artillery during the above period. Hard as was the duty, officers and men stood to their guns, until killed, wounded or captured. Can soldiers deserve higher praise?

### OUR FOREIGN NEWS.

Translated and Selected from leading European papers for the SENTINEL.

### ENGLAND.

THE OPEN DOOR IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Times—London, Nov. 24.

There has been considerable speculation in this country, in the United States and on the Continent as to the meaning of the open door policy in the Philippine Islands. Bald announcements of the intention of the American Government to extend the customs tariff of the United States to these islands have been eagerly seized upon by hostile critics, in order to suggest that English hopes are doomed to disappointment, and that the United States, while taking advantage of any doors that we may keep open in the Far East, will exclude our commerce as far as possible from territory under American control. It is, of course, easy enough to understand that certain critics are eager to find flaws in the Anglo-American understanding, which they regard with ill concealed uneasiness. For our own part we have always been aware that there are difficulties in the way of the adoption by the United States of an open door policy in the Philippines, as that policy is understood usually in this country; but we have never doubted for an instant the sincerity of the United States Government, or its ability to devise some means of substantially securing the results aimed at. Mr. Hay has now explained to anxious inquirers the policy which the Government intend to pursue. He states that the ordinary American customs tariff will be forced in the Philippines as against all nations equally, not excluding the United States themselves. For all international purposes that is the policy of the open door. Economical purists may argue that, as the tariff must operate in restraint of trade, the door is to be regarded as very partially open; but, whatever force there may be in that argument, it is of purely domestic application. Equality of treatment and absence of differential duties are the essence of the open door policy as between nation and nation. The precise footing upon which goods enter the Philippines is internationally of no consequence so long as the footing is the same for all. Any citizen who thinks himself aggrieved by the open door policy in the Philippines could probably get his case brought before the Supreme Court. But if that court were to hold, as probably it would, that the Philippines not being American territory under the Constitution, but a protectorate, the law as between State and State has no application, it is not easy to see how the private citizen could raise the abstract question of the right of the country to proclaim a protectorate at all.

Daily News—London, Nov. 24.

The interesting and important dispatch from our Correspondent at Washington throws a new light upon the possible results of American expansion. The rather vague assurances hitherto given by the American Government had been taken to mean that the goods of all nations would be admitted to the Philippine Islands free of duty. But Mr. Secretary Hay now points out that if the islands are annexed they will come at once under the ordinary tariff, which the Constitution requires to be the same throughout the Union. This, indeed, as our Correspondent says, "is not free trade." Very far from it, as Mr. Dingley can testify. Once the Philippines become a part of the Union, they could only be put under a separate tariff by an amendment of the Constitution, and the Constitution can only be amended by a majority of two-thirds of Congress, supported by three-fourths of the States. If, on the other hand, or so long as, the Philippines are held under a Protectorate, the President may make special regulations for their trade, and may provide that there shall be no import duties, though he is not, we imagine, very likely to do so. Porto Rico has been annexed, and the annexation of Cuba is virtually settled. But over the future of the Philippines a dispute is raging. We do not mean in Paris, where the Spanish Commissioners, having no choice, must give way. In America itself opinions are sharply divided between advocates of the English system and adherents to the old constitutional doctrine that all are citizens within the Union. Enthusiasm for American expansion will be considerably abated if it means the proportionate extension of the Dingley Tariff.

### THE LIPPE DETMOLD INCIDENT.

Mercury—Leeds, Nov. 22.

Lippe Detmold is a tiny principality with a population of a hundred thousand souls, and the German Emperor is one of the great monarchs of Europe, commanding an army of two millions of trained soldiers. \* \* \* The origin of the trouble may be briefly recalled. Prince Alexander, who succeeded to the throne of Lippe Detmold in 1895, is incapacitated by a mental malady from discharging the duties of his position. There were several claimants for the Regency, one of whom, Prince Adolphe of Schaumburg Lippe, was the brother in law of the German Emperor, and all the influence of Berlin was thrown into the scale in support of his candidature. The question was referred to the Supreme Court of the Empire, but the Prussian representatives in the Federal Council secured the defeat of a proposal to proclaim the Count with the necessary powers for deciding the issue. A Court of Arbitration was ultimately appointed under the Presidency of the King of Saxony, and pronounced in favor of the present Regent, Count Ernest. Prince Adolphe of Schaumburg Lippe, who had been Regent in the intervals, accordingly resigned. Unfortunately, the German Emperor has discovered a petty means of annoying the Regent who had defeated his favorite candidate in the Arbitration Court, for the troops which are raised in the

principality are drafted into the Prussian army under the terms of a military convention between Prussia and Lippe Detmold, and the principality is garrisoned with Prussian troops. The device employed by the Kaiser was as undignified as his object. For, acting in the capacity of Commander in Chief of the army, he instructed the troops in Lippe Detmold to withhold from the members of the Regent's family the military honors which are customarily paid to the families of reigning Princes. This insult not unnaturally elicited a protest from the Regent, who sent a respectful remonstrance to the Emperor. The reply was only an aggravation of the original affront, for the Regent was told by telegram (a favorite method of communication of the Kaiser's) that the General of the garrison had acted under his orders, and he was forbidden to address the Emperor on the subject again.

### THE LIFE OF PARNELL.

New Ireland.

Parnell's career was a singularly brilliant one, and yet it is the fact that when in 1874 he desired to contest a seat, he had no knowledge of the past history of his country. Even to the last there were certain subjects upon which he was confessedly ignorant and for information on the events of the past, he was keenly alive to the present and to the future. One of the most remarkable statements in the book is that given as Parnell's answer to Michael Davitt. Davitt had been putting a poser to Parnell as to the possible course of action which he as an Irish premier would take in the event of a land agitation, and Davitt felt that the answer would be an indication of the man's real feeling. And so it was, but not as the questioner had expected: "I would lock you up," came from Parnell's lips, expressing everything, though saying but little. So far as can be learnt Mr. Barry O'Brien has not given any explanation of the sudden turn towards a broad democratic policy which is to be noticed in the speeches Parnell made during the six months preceding the fatal meeting at Clonsilla. How far they indicated a real change of view or a pandering to the possible waverers, it is hard to say; and possibly no one but the dead could tell us. But the subject is of great interest to those who cannot reconcile the aristocratic landlord, the "distant despot" of Westminster with the demagogue of the "hillsiders" and the down trodden workers of the country. Some there are who see in it the recognition of the coming power which the democracy now have in the Local Government proposals; others are unable to ascribe it to any motives more worthy than expediency and a ready reliance on any straw.

The story which the book tells is one which has deeply affected the political history of Ireland. One likes to think of Parnell as he was in the spring of 1895, when the English nation had realized the false nature of the Times accusations, when the Liberal party could not see in Parnell too much honor, when the prospects of Home Rule were brighter even than in 1892. It was a splendid time; the Tory Government was suffering from attacks internal and external; the "flowing tide" was unquestionably with the Home Rule party; the Nonconformist conscience had not begun to concern itself very acutely with any subject except the throwing of the Government; and the voice of the Kenist was not heard in the land. But, as Mr. Barry O'Brien puts it, Parnell was standing on a mine; the mine was underneath the feet of the moving heaven and earth to bring about his downfall, just as during the Commission they had (as is shown in these pages) been willing to go to any lengths to buy evidence to take the place of Pigott. \* \* \* The commission charges failed; but there were other means, and the Divorce Court proceedings were the result. Over these Mr. O'Brien skips lightly, and he is right, for the politician and the man are ever separate; and the nation which accepts in 1895 as an authority on Parnell the defense of the empire that same Sir Charles Dike who was hounded out of public life in 1886, would, in Gladstone's memorable words, have taken back Parnell if he had thought fit to retire for a while. But, the whole point of this book is to show that Parnell had no intention of submitting his actions to the dictates of any English politician or of the English people; and when one thinks of his descent and of that Commodore Stewart, his grandfather, who took two English ships in 1821, and was indicted to see why he should have but little desire to humble himself before the English nation. Like Browning, he was "ever a fighter"; and whatever we may say of him, we can only say in sincerity that no politician in Ireland nowadays can hope for a following, if he is willing to go back upon the principles of independence which Parnell taught as the only way of securing to Ireland her rights. His is an intensely dramatic figure, cut off at the time of life when the politician may be considered capable of full action, and leaving behind him a memory, cherished by some, reviled by others. It is at least remarkable that his death was the signal for the reign of small men, and they still reign. As to his successor, he has yet to be born; and just as in the time of electoral reform Parnell came to be influenced by the current of his destiny, so it is open to hope that with the new era which opens for Ireland next year, the stream of human destiny will bring along some one fit to voice the nation's aspirations, to fight the nation's battles, and to quell the warring factions, as the strong man Parnell was able to do. We cannot raise great men in glasshouses, the school of life must be passed through, and in the widened liberties of a great people is scope for the development of the talents, the command over his fellows, and the sovereign reticence and self control which make Parnell more regretted than any man in the name roll of leaders in Ireland.